

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the outstanding Office Action dated March 8, 2006.

The Examiner has stated that the prior art patents cited by the specification appear to have at least two numbers transposed or are correctly cited. The specification has been corrected to overcome the objection.

Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fentress, USP 2,561,351. Moreover, the Examiner has stated that claims 3-5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In addition, the Examiner has stated that claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action. Claims 1-5 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 6-9 which are rewritten from claims 2-5 in order to overcome the rejections.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

June 8, 2006